

KBR:kbr 01/13/05 341559  
PATENT

Attorney Reference Number 6541-60665-01  
Application Number 10/039,577

Remarks

Claims 1-22 are pending. In the Office action dated December 13, 2004 [“Office action”], the Examiner imposes a two-way restriction requirement. Group 1 includes claims 1-14, 21, and 22. Group 2 includes claims 15-20.

The Applicant elects Group 1 (claims 1-14, 21, and 22) with traverse. The Applicant respectfully requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn, and that claims 1-22 be examined.

The Examiner describes Group 1 as “registration and allocation resource on different locations,” and describes Group 2 as “registration and assignment resource to the registry system.” [Office action, page 2.] The Examiner then writes “these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter.” [*Id.*] The Applicant fails to understand the Examiner’s reasoning.

The Examiner has not provided adequate details on the groups and relation between them (e.g., combination – subcombination, subcombinations usable together). [*See* MPEP 808.02, 816, 817.] The Applicant requests that the Examiner provide such details, if the Examiner maintains the restriction requirement.

The Examiner writes “these inventions … have acquired a separate status in the art,” but provides no class / sub-class information to support this position. [*Id.*] The Applicant requests that the Examiner provide such classification information, if the Examiner maintains the restriction requirement.

The Applicant acknowledges that different claims use different language, and that the scope of each claim is accordingly different. The Applicant believes, however, that searching claims 1-22 should not require searching different fields.

The Applicant fails to understand the position the Examiner appears to be taking as to “different locations” and a “registry system.” For example, the present application includes the language, “In general, the HLR 102 operates as a registry system.” [Application, page 7.] Later on the same page, the application describes first and second locations and includes the language, “In one embodiment, the second location is an HLR, but again the invention is not so limited.”

For at least these reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn, and that claims 1-22 be examined.

KBR:kbr 01/13/05 341559  
PATENT

Attorney Reference Number 6541-60665-01  
Application Number 10/039,577

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kyle E. Rinehart  
Registration No. 47,027

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 595-5300  
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446

Page 3 of 3